

REMARKS

Claims 4 has been examined and is amended. Accordingly, claim 4 is now pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration are requested. Entry of this amendment under Rule 116 is believed appropriate because the only amendment to the claims are to provide antecedent basis as suggested by the examiner. No new issues are raised or is a new search required.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The various terms lacking antecedent basis have been amended. It is noted that the syntax of an extension command is not an element but an inherent quality of the command and thus cannot be recited as “a syntax”. A marked up copy of the amended claim is attached to this amendment.

With examiner's permission, the preparation of a compact disc with a the source code listed will be deferred until the allowance of allowable subject matter.

In the traverse of the applicant's remarks, the examiner states that the applicants argued in substance that: (1) there is no disclosure in any of the cited references of the claimed step of parsing a script to identify an extension command and source locator parameter; (2) there is no disclosure of providing plug-in extension code for a scripting language platform to fetch objects by the locator parameter; and (3) there is no suggestion in the references of the claimed technique of